

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 1, 5, 6 and 15 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

It is also noted that claims 1, 5, 6, and 15 have been amended to remove the intended use and optional language discussed in items 18-21 on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action.

II. Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to for reciting “fist,” rather than “first.” Claim 1 has been amended to correct the above-identified typographical error.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Alkove (U.S. 2004/0143760) and Stefik (U.S. 5,629,980). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 5, 6, and 15 for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a content distribution system comprising a server and a receiving terminal. Further, claim 1 recites that the server comprises a content storage

section that stores contents, such that each stored content includes (i) a plurality of resources being kept, by different methods, in a state such that each resource cannot be used as is and (ii) a startup document that describes identification information identifying view licenses that are required for viewing all of the resources, such that one resource contained in one content includes first link information indicating a link destination for accessing a predetermined resource contained in the one content and includes second link information that indicates a link destination for accessing resources contained in another content and that describes reference information referring to the startup document of the another content. Further, amended claim 1 recites that the server includes a communication processing section that (i), when it is determined that a presentation request for a resource includes the first link information, distributes the predetermined resource that is accessed based on the link destination indicated by the first link information to the receiving terminal, and (ii), when it is determined that the presentation request includes the second link information, distributes the resources that are accessed based on the link destination indicated by the second link information to the receiving terminal and provides the receiving terminal with the plurality of view licenses identified by the startup document referred to by the reference information described in the second link information. In addition, amended claim 1 recites that the receiving terminal includes a view processing section that (i), when a resource is distributed from the server without a view license being provided therein, executes the view processing on the resource distributed from the server by using a view license stored in a view license storage section of the receiving terminal and (ii), when a resource is distributed from the server along with the view license, stores the view license distributed along with the resource in the view license storage section and executes view

processing on the distributed resource using the stored view license distributed along with the resource.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on Stefik for teaching the features of the communication processing section, as recited in previously presented claim 1 (see item 15 on pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action). However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which clarify the structure/operation of the communication processing section, as well as the content storage section and the view processing section, it is submitted that Stefik now fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features now required by the communication processing section, the content storage section and the view processing section, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Rather, Stefik merely teaches a method of controlling usage rights of digital works, such that desired data can be accessed by referring to and according to previously set rights information (see Figs. 7-11).

Thus, in view of the above, it is apparent that Stefik teaches that data is accessed based on previously set rights information, but fails to disclose or suggest:

(1) a server that includes a content storage section that stores contents, such that each stored content includes (i) a plurality of resources being kept, by different methods, in a state such that each resource cannot be used as is and (ii) a startup document that describes identification information identifying view licenses that are required for viewing all of the resources, such that one resource contained in one content includes first link information indicating a link destination for accessing a predetermined resource

contained in the one content and includes second link information that indicates a link destination for accessing resources contained in another content and that describes reference information referring to the startup document of the another content;

(2) a server that includes a communication processing section that (i), when it is determined that a presentation request for a resource includes the first link information, distributes the predetermined resource that is accessed based on the link destination indicated by the first link information to the receiving terminal, and (ii), when it is determined that the presentation request includes the second link information, distributes the resources that are accessed based on the link destination indicated by the second link information to the receiving terminal and provides the receiving terminal with the plurality of view licenses identified by the startup document referred to by the reference information described in the second link information; and

(3) a receiving terminal that includes a view processing section that (i), when a resource is distributed from the server without a view license being provided therein, executes the view processing on the resource distributed from the server by using a view license stored in a view license storage section of the receiving terminal and (ii), when a resource is distributed from the server along with the view license, stores the view license distributed along with the resource in the view license storage section and executes view processing on the distributed resource using the stored view license distributed along with the resource, as required by claim 1.

In other words, Stefik teaches that usage rights are checked for all requests independently of a state before processing the usage right. Therefore, Stefik fails to disclose or suggest that

processing is different depending on what resource is used before the presentation of a request for a new resource, such that when it is determined that a presentation request for a resource includes the first link information, distributes the predetermined resource that is accessed based on the link destination indicated by the first link information to the receiving terminal, and (ii), when it is determined that the presentation request includes the second link information, distributes the resources that are accessed based on the link destination indicated by the second link information to the receiving terminal and provides the receiving terminal with the plurality of view licenses identified by the startup document referred to by the reference information described in the second link information, and a receiving terminal that includes a view processing section that (i), when a resource is distributed from the server without a view license being provided therein, executes the view processing on the resource distributed from the server by using a view license stored in a view license storage section of the receiving terminal and (ii), when a resource is distributed from the server along with the view license, stores the view license distributed along with the resource in the view license storage section and executes view processing on the distributed resource using the stored view license distributed along with the resource, as required by claim 1

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claim 2 that depends therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Alkove and Stefik.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Alkove and/or Stefik or elsewhere in the prior art of record that would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Alkove and/or Stefik to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is

respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claim 2 that depends therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 5, 6 and 15 are directed to a server, a receiving terminal, and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 6 and 15 are allowable over Alkove.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tatsuya SHIMOJI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.04.30 15:19:02 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 30, 2009